

## **Regional Stormwater Monitoring Program (RSMP)**

### **Pooled Resources Oversight Committee**

#### **Draft Agenda and Meeting Notes**

Tuesday, June 3, 2014 from 9:30 am – 12:10 pm at USGS office in Tacoma

#### **Oversight Committee Members Present:**

##### Permittee representatives:

☒ Will Appleton (Federal Way)

☒ Heather Kibbey (Everett)

☒ Kit Paulsen (Bellevue) or ☐ Phyllis Varner

☒ Jim Simmonds (King County)

##### Other stakeholder representatives:

☐ Chris Konrad or ☒ Jay Davis (USFWS)

☐ Tom Putnam or ☐ Katelyn Kinn

☒ Bruce Wulkan (PSP) or ☒ Abby Barnes (WDNR)

**Staff:** Brandi Lubliner (Ecology) and Karen Dinicola (Ecology)

**Others in attendance:** Ben Parrish (Covington), Kelly Uhacz (Battle Ground), Carla Vincent (Pierce County)

#### **Proposed Agenda and Notes from the Discussion**

9:30 Welcome and introductions, review agenda and goals for today's meeting

Interim members continuing to meet. New members will be confirmed at June 11 SWG meeting.

9:40 Review outcome of RSMP Effectiveness Studies Workshops and list of proposed studies

**Final list of topics and input from the workshop participants** – review of process and workshop feedback.

**Feedback from May 14 SWG meeting** – Most SWG members willing to fund all ten projects unless fatal flaw.

**Feedback from permittees** – Even the lowest ranked proposals in survey were in multiple permittees' top 3

**Ecology staff review of bioretention proposal** - Bruce would like this kind of feedback on all of the proposals that involve soil mixtures. Ecology engineer review of other proposals will be helpful. Key is to get right kind of feedback from the review as to the credibility of the science: not "we don't like the question" but rather "the study will or will not answer the question; the approach is scientifically valid" and "the expected application of the findings is clearly articulated and appropriate." Studies have already been filtered for informing permittees' SWMPs; will they inform the permits and changes to the manual?

**Third party review of other proposals** – Can't fund external review in advance of money from permittees. Some funds coming in early, but still need contracting. Steering committee will be convened for paired watershed study; this idea should be replicated for the group of bioretention studies. PROC should review detailed scopes of work. PROC role: is the scope achievable/implementable at the proposed cost? Not all studies need QAPPs.

**Who should get contracts this summer, who starts later** – Start with 4; PROC review scopes of work. For the hydrologic performance study, ask proponents what will happen if they don't get 20 sites; how will that affect the study? For the rain garden study, articulate the process for identifying what information

will be gathered and make that a deliverable to be approved before proceeding.

#### Recommendations to SWG:

By consensus, the Pooled Resources Oversight Committee (PROC) recommends that the Stormwater Work Group forward these recommendations for funding the first round of RSMP Effectiveness Studies to Ecology on June 11, 2014:

1. All ten of study proposals that came out of the RSMP Effectiveness Studies Workshops should move forward for the Ecology contracting process. Funding will be contingent upon the review and approval of the scope, schedule, list of deliverables, and budget by the PROC.
2. Four proposals should move forward this summer:
  - a. Paired Urban Small Stream Watershed Restoration Effectiveness Study
    - A steering committee will be convened to inform the streamflow monitoring design and approach, and identify the best indicators.
  - b. Effectiveness of Bioretention in Reducing Stormwater Flows, Pollutants and Toxicity
    - An Ecology engineer reviewed this proposal and the project proponents will respond to the comments as part of developing the QAPP.
  - c. Effectiveness of treating highway runoff to Echo Lake with LID retrofits
    - An Ecology engineer should review this study as soon as possible.
  - d. Can bioretention prevent toxicity to coho salmon exposed to road runoff?
    - An Ecology engineer should review this study as soon as possible.
3. PROC members should review a detailed scope of work for the first four, focusing on the proposed deliverables. The RSMP Coordinator will facilitate this process. The purposes of the reviews are to discern:
  - a. Do the deliverables clearly accomplish/support the intent of the proposal?
  - b. Is the budget reasonable given the level of effort and resources proposed?
  - c. Are the schedule, approach, and key assumptions reasonable?
4. Do a close inspection of estimated costs in each proposal, including contracting processes and overhead rates on pass-through funding. Consider appropriate contingency funding. Find opportunities for equipment sharing or rental in lieu of purchase.
5. Do a gap analysis in advance of requesting another round of proposals in about 2 years to allocate the remainder of the funds.
6. A third party technical and scientific review of the remaining study proposals may be sought to identify fatal flaws and improve the projects.
7. Specific, project-specific suggestions for further consideration include:
  - a. Include as-built information/documentation as part of bioinfiltration study QAPPs.
  - b. Disposal costs for catch basin maintenance would require substantial additional data evaluation and should be considered as a separate, future project.
  - c. Consider adding funding for the substantial staff time that will be required to collect data for the catch basin and source controls studies.
  - d. Add an additional year of monitoring and evaluation of the wet pond in the bioretention effectiveness study.
  - e. For the hydrologic performance study, articulate what would happen if the full desired number of facilities could not be found. How would that affect the study?
  - f. For rain gardens, articulate process and early deliverable of what info the project would continue to gather. Have a steering committee of local jurisdictions help define this.

10:50 Break

11:00 Review and discuss and scope of RSMP Status and Trends Monitoring

**Review and discuss feedback from May 14 SWG meeting** – generally agreeable to PROC recommendations

**Discuss feedback from permittees** – Permittees at local caucus meeting want to gather as much locally-relevant information as possible; they suggested dropping the periphyton in favor of adding more WQI sites. Periphyton at 30 sites is <\$11K so would only fund one additional site. Not a good tradeoff. They also asked about modifying the permit to allow opt-out monitoring to be conducted during the 2015 calendar year rather than the 2015 water year so that it is done during the same time as the RSMP sites.

**Look at budget numbers** – Placeholder for streamflow analysis. Need a proposal and further discussion before moving forward with pressure transducers; particularly: what data would they provide? Remaining questions about Mussel watch FTE costs per site will decrease as other parties join the study and share in overall implementation costs. Lab and equipment costs per site are set. No new info on sediment monitoring. Bacteria – continue to follow up with WDOH.

*\*\* NOTE: Brandi and Karen discovered a spreadsheet error the day following the meeting, one formula double counted a total. So we do not need to worry about the buffer at this point, and we can discuss adding more WQI sites back in.*

**Status of small streams monitoring: Site confirmation, plans to conduct the monitoring (finish QAPP and know who gets contracts toward end of July), and ongoing coordination needs (create an implementation team?)** – USGS memo: 25 sites of 60 visited so far are good for sampling. They may need to visit as many as 200 sites to get 100. Should have the work done by the end of June. Will share list of sites at that point so that local governments interested in participating in the sampling can put proposals together for contracting.

**What do we recommend to the SWG as the scope for this round of stats and trends monitoring?** – Clarify that site numbers are inclusive of opt-out sites; not duplicate sampling. RSMP will pay for sites to make up the target numbers. We will likely need to further reduce the scope to achieve a comfortable buffer.

*\*\* see note above about spreadsheet error. Subsequent email discussion to revert to original recommendation.*

By consensus, the Pooled Resources Oversight Committee (PROC) recommends that the Stormwater Work Group forward these recommendations for the scope of the Regional Stormwater Monitoring Program (RSMP) Status and Trends Monitoring to Ecology on June 11, 2014:

1. Maintain a budget buffer of 10-15% for RSMP cost overruns.
2. All of the site numbers in the recommendations below are inclusive of opt-out sites in the referenced list. (The RSMP will sample the recommended number of sites, less sites on the list that will be sampled by permittees who elected to conduct their own status and trends monitoring.)
  - a. Keep stream benthos and sediment chemistry monitoring at all 100 sites.
  - b. Reduce Water Quality Index (WQI) sampling sites from 50 inside and 50 outside UGAs to no fewer than 30 inside and 30 outside Urban Growth Areas (UGAs).

- i. Add metals (copper, chromium, zinc, lead, cadmium, silver, and arsenic) and PAHs to all WQI sites.
  - ii. Reduce periphyton sampling from 100 sites to 30 sites inside the UGA.
- c. Monitor nearshore sediment chemistry and mussels at a total of 40 nearshore sites.
- d. Eliminate the nearshore bacteria sampling. Instead, conduct an analysis of local government (including opt-outs), WDOH, and other data to recommend future monitoring for this indicator.
- 3. Begin work on contracting for the small streams monitoring as soon as possible. When sites are confirmed, get estimates of travel and labor costs from entities interested in conducting the monitoring.
- 4. Continue to develop the budget with additional detailed information. Continue to refine the cost estimates and bring decisions to the PROC.
- 5. Continue to explore opportunities to coordinate with USGS NAWQA study and cooperative funding program.

12:05 Recap of meeting and points for discussion at June 11 SWG meeting; review decisions and next steps, including timing and plans for next PROC meeting: Two sets of recommendations on RSMP to forward to Ecology for implementation. Karen will send out draft recommendations today for PROC review by noon tomorrow. Next PROC meeting will be in late July. Karen will send out a doodle poll. PROC will review SOWs for contracts.

12:10 Adjourn